UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/878,305	06/12/2001	Toshiya Kanazawa	35.C15627	3029

5514 7590 01/12/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
PENDERGRASS, KYLE M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2624	

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/878,305	KANAZAWA, TOSHIYA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kyle M Pendergrass	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 31 is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 58, line 9, the word "*are*" appears to be a typo error. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 58, line 17, the phrase *"is not set be executed"* is incomplete. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 8 recites the limitation "said operation menu" in page 50, line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 1 does not include an operation menu.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 7-8, 10-22, & 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitsuhashi et al. (US 6,369,905) & Wood et al. (US 6,453,127).

Regarding claim 1, Mitsuhashi et al., teach an image processing apparatus **(figure 4, printer 1500)** accessed by external apparatuses **(figure 4, host computer 100, & column5: lines 31-35, a system can comprise plural apparatuses and can be applied to a network)**, comprising:

display means of a printer **(figure 1, operation panel 1501)** having different display areas **(column 4:lines 3-4, operation panel 1501 with switches and lights)**;

transmission means **(figure 4, bidirectional interface 13)** for transmitting information for a client display screen **(figure 4, CRT 10)** in which a message to be displayed on said display means is input, to an external apparatus externally connected to said image processing apparatus **(column 7: lines 31-37, printer 1500 sends operation panel display status information to host computer 100 to display on the display screen)**;

and reception means **(figure 4, bidirectional interface 13)** for receiving first message information based on a message input by the first client **(figure 4, host computer 100)** via the client display screen **(figure 4, CRT 10)** displayed on the basis of said client display screen information **(column 7:lines 38-42, printer 1500 receives information from the host computer 100 based on current display settings)**, wherein said display means displays the message in one of said different display areas on the basis of said received first message information **(column 7:lines 42-45, printer operation panel 1501 reflects settings/information from virtual panel of host computer 100 and displays a message based on the information sent by the host computer 100)**.

However, Mitsuhashi et al., do not teach the image processing apparatus having a Web server accessible by the external apparatuses.

Wood et al., teach a Web interface between a printer and users **(column 2:line 65 – column 3:line 5)**.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have used the Web network taught by Wood et al., in the teachings of Mitsuhashi et al., because it would allow the printer to be accessed by more clients in non-local locations.

Regarding claim 2, the claim rejection of claim 1 is representative of claim 2. See Mitsuhashi et al., wherein said first message information contains display area information for providing such control that the message is displayed in one of said different areas **(column 7:lines 42-45, printer operation panel 1501 reflects settings sent from virtual panel of host computer 100)**, and wherein said display area information is based on different input areas of said client display screen **(column 7:line 49 – column 8:lines 12, display areas consist of: indicators L1 to L5, display D, KEY1 to KEY8, which are manipulated by host 100, and resultant changes are sent to printer 1500 where the operation panel 1501 is update to reflect information sent by host 100)**.

Regarding claim 7, the claim rejection of claim 1 is representative of claim 7. See Mitsuhashi et al., wherein said different display areas include a first display area **(figure 9, indicators L3, L4, & L5)** as a status display area for displaying a status of said image processing apparatus **(figure 9, indicators L3, L4, & L5 display whether printer 1500 is ready, if data is transmitting, and other indications concerning status) and a second display area (figure 9, KEY1 to KEY8)** as an operation menu display area for displaying an operation menu of said image processing apparatus **(column 8:lines 17-27, KEY1 to KEY8 are used as an operation menu)**.

Regarding claim 8, the claim rejection of claim 1 is representative of claim 8. See Mitsuhashi et al., wherein said display means has a function of accepting an operation input via said operation menu **(column 8:lines 13-22, KEY1 to KEY8 may be selected/accepted as input)**.

Regarding claim 10, the claim rejection of claim 7 is representative of claim 10. In the Mitsuhashi et al., device, the current display settings are given priority to display over past display settings. The display settings showing the status and operation values are refreshed when new setting values are sent from the host computer. When the current status message no longer needs to be displayed, the first message in the form of a new status message matching the original status message sent by the host computer in the past can be display displayed in the display area **(column 7:lines 42-45, printer operation panel 1501**

reflects settings from virtual panel of host computer 100 which in this case would reflect the first message settings as described in claim 1).

Regarding claim 11, the claim rejection of claim 7 is representative of claim 11. See Mitsuhashi et al., teach a display means that displays a message in said first display area and/or said second display area when no operation has been performed via said operation menu for a predetermined period of time **(column 9:lines 15-22, after a predetermined time in the inhibition state, a permission state is enabled in the printer display and the message sent by host computer is now enabled to display)**.

Regarding claim 12, the claim rejection of claim 11 is representative of claim 12. See Mitsuhashi et al., wherein a timing used when no operation has been performed via said operation menu for the predetermined period of time corresponds to an auto clear operation of resetting a display screen displayed on the display means of said image processing apparatus **(figure 12, steps 12-15, when a predetermined time reaches a threshold, the state in the printer panel is changed to permissible and the panel lamp display is turned on/reset).**

Regarding claim 13, the claim rejection for claim 1 is representative of claim 13. See Mitsuhashi et al., teachings wherein said transmission means transmits second message information based on the first message information received from said reception means, to an external apparatus of a second client externally connected to said image processing means **(column 7:lines 42-45, the printer operation panel 1501 reflects settings/information from virtual panel of host computer 100 and displays a message based on the first message information sent by the host computer 100. Figure 11, step 10, illustrates that second message information, which is indicated by the panel lights turning off for other clients when panel operation is inhibited by the host computer 100, is sent to other clients in the system and is based on the first message information indicating use of the printer by the host computer 100 and inhibiting use by other clients)**, and wherein the information transmitted to the external apparatus of said second Web client is screen information displayed on a

screen of the external apparatus of said second client **(column 8:lines 36-66 & figure 11, a printer panel locking sequence from a host 100 which sends a first information message inhibiting panel operation. In the plural client web network as taught by Wood et al., the panel operation is then inhibited from other clients by the turning off of the panel lamp, i.e. second message information. Since the operation panel is sent as a virtual image to clients of the system, the display message for the other clients is effected by the inhibit flag, as seen in figure 11, set by the host 100)**.

Regarding claim 14, the claim rejection for claim 13 is representative of claim 14. See Mitsuhashi et al., wherein said client display screen information contains a function of setting whether or not said second message information based on the first message information displayed on said display means is displayed on the screen of the external apparatus of said second client **(following the sequence laid out in figure 11 & column 36-66, the host 100 controls whether of not the panel turns off by selecting a "permissible" of "inhibited" state on the virtual display, i.e. if "inhibited" is selected, the second message will display)**, and the apparatus **(figure 1, printer 1500)** has means for controlling whether or not to display said second message information on the screen of the external apparatus of said second client, depending on said setting for the display **(column 9:lines 14-22, the printer 1500 controls whether or not the client sees the second message by counting for a predetermined time period)**.

Claims 15-22, 27 & 28 recite identical features as claims 1-8, 13 & 14 respectively, except claims 15-22, 27 & 28 are method claims. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claims 1-8, 13 & 14 are equally applicable to claims 15-22, 27 & 28.

Claims 24, 25 & 26 recite identical features as claims 10, 11, 12 respectively, except claims 24, 25 & 26 are method claims. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claims 10, 11, 12 are equally applicable to claims 24, 25 & 26.

Regarding claim 29, Mitsuhashi et al., disclose a program **(column 5:lines 43-44, control program stored in ROM 2)** executed by the image processing apparatus as claimed in claim 1 by Mitsuhashi et al., and Wood et al.

Regarding claim 30, Mitsuhashi et al., disclose a computer readable storage medium storing a program **(column 5:lines 43-44, control program stored in ROM 2)** executed by an image processing apparatus as claimed in claim 1 by Mitsuhashi et al., and Wood et al.

Claims 3 & 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitsuhashi et al. (US 6,369,905) & Wood et al. (US 6,453,127) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Wells et al. (US 5,870,683).

Regarding claim 3, Mitsuhashi et al., and Wood et al., teach the claim rejection of claim 1, but do not teach that the first message information is displayed with different timings.

However, Wells et al., teaches a display 20 **(fig. 2)**, that uses different timings to display a message **(column 3:line 64 – column 4:line3, & figures 3A-4C, animated messages are shown on multiple areas of the screen and at different timings for displaying the messages).**

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to have used the timed display of messages taught by Wells et al., in the display system taught by Mitsuhashi et al., and Wood et al., because it would have allowed for the user to control the display timing of the messages **(column 2:lines 18-33).**

Regarding claim 4, the claim rejection of claim 3 is representative of claim 4. See Wells et al, teachings of a display 20 **(fig. 2)**, that uses different timings to display a message corresponding to different areas **(column 3:line 64 – column 4:line3, & figures 3A-4C, animated messages are shown on multiple areas of the screen and at different timings for displaying the messages).**

Claims 5, 6, 9 & 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colbert et al. (US 5,699,494) & Wood et al. (US 6,453,127).

Regarding claim 5, Colbert et al., teach an image processing apparatus **(figure 1, printer 16)** accessed by external apparatuses **(figure 1, host 11)**, comprising:

display means of a printer **(figure 1, printer operation panel 35 with display 37)** having different display areas **(column 9:lines 61-63, display 37 with four separate lines);**

transmission means **(column 10:line 62, parallel port 77)** for transmitting information for a client display screen **(column 6:lines 44-45, replica 35' mimics printer operation panel 35)** in which a message to be displayed on said display means is input, to an external apparatus externally connected to said image processing apparatus **(column 10:line 56 – column 11:line 6, printer 16 communicates bi-directionally with host 11 using NPAP task 131 to supply printer status information);**

and reception means **(column 10:line 62, parallel port 77)** for receiving first message information based on a message input by the first client **(figure 1, host 11)** via the client display screen **(figure 1, replica 35' on display 13)** displayed on the basis of said client display screen information, wherein said display means displays the message in one of said different display areas on the basis of said received first message information **(column 10:lines 49-55, information displayed at any given time is determined by inputs received from replica 35'of host),**

wherein said first message information contains deletion information indicating whether or not the message displayed by said display means can be deleted **(column 10:Table I, pushbutton function messages are sent to the printer and they can include a RESET option that indicates that values of the pushbuttons shown on the display can be reset to default).**

However, Colbert et al., do not teach the image processing apparatus having a Web server accessible by the external apparatuses.

Wood et al., teach a Web interface between a printer and users **(column 2:line 65 – column 3:line 5)**.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have used the Web network taught by Wood et al., in the teachings of Mitsuhashi et al., because it would allow the printer to be accessed by more clients in non-local locations.

Regarding claim 6, the claim rejection of claim 5 is representative of claim 6. See Colbert et al., wherein that portion of the deletion information indicating whether or not said message can be deleted which indicates that the message can be deleted contains deletion button information on a displayed deletion button **(column 10:Table I, pushbutton function messages are sent to the printer and they can include a RESET button that enables a reset function to reset the values of the pushbuttons shown on the display to default)**.

Regarding claim 9, Colbert et al., teach an image processing apparatus **(figure 1, printer 16)** accessed by external apparatuses **(figure 1, host 11),** comprising:

display means of a printer **(figure 1, printer operation panel 35 with display 37)** having different display areas **(column 9:lines 61-63, display 37 with four separate lines);**

transmission means **(column 10:line 62, parallel port 77)** for transmitting information for a client display screen **(column 6:lines 44-45, replica 35' mimics printer operation panel 35)** in which a message to be displayed on said display means is input, to an external apparatus externally connected to said image processing apparatus **(column 10:line 56 – column 11:line 6, printer 16 communicates bi-directionally with host 11 using NPAP task 131 to supply printer status information)**;

and reception means **(column 10:line 62, parallel port 77)** for receiving first message information based on a message input by the first client **(figure 1, host 11)** via the client display screen **(figure 1, replica 35' on display 13)** displayed on the basis of said client display screen information, wherein said display means displays the message in one of said different display areas on the basis of said received first message information **(column 10:lines 49-55, information displayed at any given time is determined by inputs received from replica 35'of host),**

wherein said display means has a function of accepting an operation input via said operation menu **(column 10:lines 49-55, display accepts operation input by way of push button selection)**, and wherein if said message is displayed in said second display area, the function of accepting the operation input via said operation menu is not executed **(column 10:lines 37-43, display area clears and shows "SAVED," momentarily preventing another selection via the operation menu)**.

However, Colbert et al., do not teach the image processing apparatus having a Web server accessible by the external apparatuses.

Wood et al., teach a Web interface between a printer and users **(column 2:line 65 – column 3:line 5)**.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have used the Web network taught by Wood et al., in the teachings of Mitsuhashi et al., because it would allow the printer to be accessed by more clients in non-local locations.

Claim 23 recites identical features as claim 9 except claim 23 is a method claim. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 9 is equally applicable to claim 23.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 31-33, 36-38, & 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yun (US 6,226,472).

Regarding claim 31, Yun teaches an image processing apparatus **(figure 1, printer 10)** implementing **(column 6:line 29-column 7: 47 & figure 3)** a process by which controller 11 dtermines what message to display on display 13, and comprising:

accepting means **(figure 1, controller 11)** for accepting a setting for a message displayed on a display unit provided in an image processing apparatus **(column 6:lines 50-52, controller 11 accepts a message indicating a *ready mode* or *power saving mode*)** as well as a setting for a timing for display of said message **(column 6:lines 29-33, controller 11 accepts current time of inactivity from the host computer 30 when print data is not received in order to time the display of a message indicating a *ready mode* or *power saving mode*),**

storing means for storing a setting for a predetermined process to be executed by said image processing apparatus **(NOTE: storing means, although not specifically mentioned, ... needed for storing predetermined mode-switching process described in figure 3);**

determining means **(figure 1, controller 11)** determining whether or not the setting for the timing accepted by said accepting means is effective, on the basis of the predetermined process setting stored in the storage means **(column 6:lines 50-58, controller 11 uses the predetermined mode-switching process to determine whether the timing is effective for switching the mode, i.e. whether timing input from host computer 30 meets the predetermined inactivity period for sending a *power saving mode* message);**

and means for executing, if the determining step has determined that the setting is ineffective, a process corresponding the ineffectiveness of the setting for the timing for the display of the message **(column 6:lines 50-58, if timing is ineffective, i.e. current timing of inactivity sent from host computer 30 does not meet the predetermined inactivity period for sending a *power saving mode* message, then the process for a *ready mode* message to be sent is executed).**

Regarding claim 32, the claim rejection of claim 31 is representative of claim 32. See Yun teachings wherein said timing is one with which a predetermined process is executed by said image processing apparatus message **(figure 3 includes a predetermined *power saving mode*-switching process that is executed with the current time of inactivity from the host computer 30, i.e. the timing)**, and if the predetermined process stored in said storage means is not set to be executed, said determining means determines that the setting for the timing is ineffective **(column 6:lines 50-58, if timing is ineffective, i.e. current timing of inactivity sent from host computer 30 does not meet the predetermined inactivity period for sending a *power saving mode* message, then the predetermined *power saving* mode-switching process is not executed, and the controller, i.e. the determining means, runs a process for a *ready mode* message to be sent, which signals that the controller 11 has determined the timing is ineffective)**.

Regarding claim 33, the claim rejection of claim 31 is representative of claim 33. See Yun teachings wherein the predetermined process executed correspondingly to said ineffectiveness comprises displaying a warning message or changing the setting stored in said storage means so that the setting for the timing for displaying said message is effective **(column 6:lines 50-52 & figure 3, step 140 outputs "NO" signal if *power saving mode* is not executed then the timing was ineffective, i.e. not met by the predetermined period of inactivity. The printer displays a *ready mode* message that lights the display, warning the user that the *power saving mode* is not operating)**.

Claims 36-38 recite identical features as claims 31-33 respectively, except claims 36-38 are method claims. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claims 31-33 are equally applicable to claims 36-38.

Regarding claim 41, Yun teaches a program **(figure 3, process executed by controller 11)** to be executed by an image processing apparatus as claimed in claim 31.

Regarding claim 42, Yun teaches a computer readable storage medium storing program codes for execution in the apparatus as claimed in claim 31. Note also that a computer readable storage medium, although not mentioned specifically by Yun, is essential if the process executed by the controller 11 in figure 3 is to function. Therefore, a computer readable storage medium is inherent to the teachings of Yun.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 34-35 & 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yun (US 6,226,472) as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Colbert et al. (US 5,699,494).

Regarding claim 34, Yun teaches the image processing apparatus according to claim 31, but does not teach wherein said accepting means accepts the setting for the message and the setting for the timing for displaying said message, the settings being transmitted from a terminal device externally connected to said image processing apparatus.

However, Colbert et al., teaches an interface replicating the printer display that sends settings chosen by a host computer to the display of the printer so it displays the same content as shown on the host computer display **(column 10:lines 49-55, information displayed at any given time on printer display is determined by inputs received from replica 35'of host computer)**.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have used the printer display interface taught by Colbert et al., for the display of Yun because it would allow the printer to be controlled and accessed by external computers via an interface replicating the printer display.

Regarding claim 35, Yun teaches the image processing apparatus according to claim 33, but does not teach wherein the process of displaying said warning message comprises transmitting said warning message to the terminal device externally connected to said image processing apparatus.

However, Colbert et al., teaches an interface replicating the printer display that sends settings chosen by a host computer to the display of the printer so it displays the same content as shown on the host computer display **(column 10:lines 49-55, information displayed at any given time on printer display is determined by inputs received from replica 35'of host computer)**.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have used the printer display interface taught by Colbert et al., for the display of Yun because it would allow the printer to be controlled and accessed by external computers via an interface replicating the printer display.

Claims 39 & 40 recite identical features as claims 34 & 35 respectively, except claims 39 & 40 are method claims. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claims 34 & 35 are equally applicable to claims 39 & 40.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle Pendergrass whose telephone number is (703) 306-3445. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiners supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (703) 308-7452. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned in (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application of proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.

KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER